

All communications respecting this application should give the serial number, date of filing and name of the applicant.



**U. S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

| Application Number | Filing Date | First Named Applicant | Attorney Docket Number |
|--------------------|-------------|-----------------------|------------------------|
| 09/759,965 | 01/12/01 | Heisey | 8398 |

| Examiner |
|-------------|
| L. E. Crane |

| Art Unit | Paper No. |
|----------|-----------|
| 1623 | 12 |

DATE MAILED: n/a

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel)

(1) Ms. Bryn M. Taylor

(3) Mr. S. Robert Chuey.

(2) Examiner L. E. Crane

(4) --.

Date of Interview: 10/07/02.

Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Personal (copy given to) ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No If yes, brief description: See attachment.

Agreement ☐ was reached with respect to some of all of the claims in question. ☒ was not reached

Claim(s) discussed: See page 2.

Identification of prior art discussed: See page 2.

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comment: S e p. 2.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would be allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP § 713.04) If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. ☐ Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, the completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an attachment to another form.

PTOL-413 (amended 03/13/01)

09/759,965 - P. N. 12

COPY FOR ☒ File ☐ Applicant

Continued n n xt page(s) -->

Art Unit 1623

INTERVIEW SUMMARY(cont.)

Claims discussed: All remaining of record, claims 1-2, 4, 7-14, 16 and 19-50 in particular.

Identification of prior art discussed: The 21 references cited as prior art, references AB and R in particular were referred to briefly.

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comment: Applicant was advised that examiner had not found any showing of unexpected results and therefore that allowability seemed to be highly unlikely. As to the changes proposed by the FAX sent to examiner by Ms. Taylor on October 4, 2002, examiner agreed that the proposed changes would simplify the case in the event of appeal and therefore would be entered if submitted as a amendment after final. Applicant indicated that the broad scope of the art rejection made it difficult to formulate claims. Examiner replied that the broad scope of the claims made it difficult to draft narrow grounds of rejection. Examiner also noted that certain claims hinted at what applicant apparently was ultimately interested in claiming but that generic terms including "amino sugars" and "glycoaminoglycans" made narrow grounds of rejection difficult to formulate. And examiner noted that applicant had not elected to provide any narrowly defined claims of the kind under discussion.

Applicant indicated that assignee (Procter & Gamble) intended to claim a product for consumption by hosts suffering from diseases, particularly diabetes, and that the composition to be administered would include glucosamine in a beverage but with sweetening with minimum additional caloric content (minimum of carbohydrate sweeteners) in order to insure both palatability and compatibility with dietary limitations on carbohydrate intake. Examiner noted that applicant had yet to submit any claim which specifically limited the subject matter to such a composition, and had not provided any data to support unexpected results of any kind.

Applicant indicated the intention to file both a Notice of Appeal and an amendment after final rejection by FAX.